REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 19, 2005 has been received and carefully studied.

An RCE is filed herewith.

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. By the accompanying amendment, claim 4 has been amended to recite that one of the inlet or outlet comprises a spherical portion. It is believed that the amendment overcomes the rejection.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite "separation unit" as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner rejects claim 4 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 5-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,749 in view of any one of Higashijima or Abos or Boyd. Submitted herewith is a terminal disclaimer to overcome the rejection.

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Higashijima, U.S. Patent No. 5,397,462, and claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Higashijima in view of either Abos or Boyd. The Examiner states that Higashijima disclose a filter unit that is connected between a source and receptacle wherein the connection is via a single swivel motion as seen in Figures 4 and 5. Abos and Boyd are cited for their disclosures of spring biased closure valves to prevent

spillage of liquid during change-out.

By the accompanying amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the single pivot motion is of the separation unit.

Higashijima et al. do not disclose or suggest a separation unit having either an inlet or an outlet that is engageable with a respective one of a first portion or second portion of a manifold by a single pivot motion of the separation unit after the other of the inlet or outlet is engaged with a respective one of the first portion or second portion of the manifold as recited in claim 1.

Instead, as detailed in column 5, lines 18-41 of Higashijima et al., once the cartridge mounting base 46 is fixed to the lower portion of the cartridge 14, the spring 40 is compressed by forcing the cartridge towards the base, and the assembly is tilted or "turned on a side" so that it is accommodated into the housing 10. This is shown in Figure 4. However, what follows is not a single pivot motion of the cartridge as required by the instant claims, but rather are several motions that are not swivels. Specifically, the next step is further compressing spring 40 so that the cartridge mounting base 46 is partially inserted into the chamber 38 of the supporting base 26 by a pressing action. <u>This is not a pivot motion</u>. It is only then that the cartridge is turned so that it can be vertically oriented in the housing 10. Notably, however, that the top fitting or sleeve 55 of the cartridge is still not engaged with the housing; this requires yet another vertical movement of the cartridge, lifting the cartridge

up so as to insert the sleeve 22 of the upper cover member 11 into the sleeve 55 of the cartridge.

Accordingly, Higashijima et al. do not disclose or suggest an inlet or outlet that is engageable with one portion of a manifold after the other of the inlet or outlet is engaged with another portion of the manifold, by using a single pivot motion of the separation unit as claimed.

Regarding claims 2-3, Boyd '801 discloses a detachable in-line filter that has spillage prevention valves to prevent fluid from leaking when the filter is removed from the line. It is also attached to a manifold with threaded fittings and does not disclose the single pivot motion as recited in claim 1.

Abos '397 discloses a water-filter with a self-sealing disconnect mechanism. Check valves are automatically opened when the filter is installed, and are automatically closed when the filter is disconnected from the water system. It does not disclose the single pivot motion as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweetland, U.S. Patent No. 1,791,046 in view of either Abos or Boyd. The Examiner states that Sweetland discloses an embodiment with opposed inlet 9/outlet 4 in which the bottom inlet 9 is first connected to the prefit line 11 and then upper bracket portion is pivoted down to engage the top outlet 4 for allowing filtrate to be removed from the filter. Abos and Boyd again are cited for their disclosures of closure valves.

By the accompanying amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the single pivot motion is of the separation unit housing. Sweetland discloses first connecting the bottom inlet 9 to the pipe 11, followed by moving the upper bracket downward to engage the top outlet 4 for allowing filtrate to be removed from the filter. Sweetland does not disclose or suggest a single pivot motion of the separation unit housing as now recited in claim 1. Neither Abos nor Boyd supplies this deficiency.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin S. Lemack
Reg. No. 32,579
176 E. Main Street - Suite 7
Westboro, Massachusetts 01581
TEL: (508)898-1818